



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

... I have sufficient confidence in our institutions to believe that they will survive all the onslaughts of discussion and political controversy. But democracy cannot be preserved if representation is denied. Apart from the matter of principle, the procedure is futile. To shut out the duly elected representatives of the Socialists is merely to multiply Socialists by the thousands. Instead of protecting us from revolution, it will do more to encourage the spirit of revolution and to strengthen the advocates of violence than any conceivable propaganda could accomplish."

Here we have an American voice indeed, reassuring us that perhaps after all the world war may not have been fought in vain.

Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, sent a New Year's message to the nation in which he said:

"I wish that 1920 may be a Lincoln year, a Lincoln year in which our people will learn to look at things through Lincoln's eyes—those kind, wise, steadfast, honest eyes, in which there was neither malice nor envy, but a great sympathy in a noble, common sense. Why can't we make this 1920 a Lincoln year?"

In the face of the threatening onslaught from out the depths of a vicious and discredited past, we would take these words in all their fullness and simplicity, and we would make them our own.

Now is the time to take our bearings. If only we remember our America at its best, we need fear no evil. Our government is the expression of the popular will and must be kept so. As said Mr. Justice Brewer, "Our government is as much bound by the laws of Congress as an individual." Magna Charta bound the king and queen by the laws; indeed, the King of England swears, in his coronation oath, "to observe the laws." Even the French monarchical constitution of 1791 established that, "There is in France no authority above that of the law. The king reigns only by the law, and it is only in the name of the law that he can exact obedience."

Thus the Austinian theory of a limitless and uncontrolled power in the State, a theory thoroughly Prussian in its nature and contrary to all right interpretations of democracy, cannot be American, for America and individual opportunity must be preserved. In the language of John M. Zane, writing most convincingly in the *American Law Review* of November-December, 1919,

"A country ruled by law that binds government and citizen alike, the aspiration of Aristotle and Cicero, the hope of the great Roman jurists, the ideal of the saints, the goal of all the ages, is with us a reality, and we confidently look forward to a future where the same rule of law will compel all nations to dwell in peace and concord."

Amid all the welter, threats, and dire forebodings, the swagger and truculence, the real America becomes here and there articulate, and the real America is a very beautiful thing. It cannot be overcome by evil, for its destiny is to overcome evil with good.

MILITARISM

ELSEWHERE in these columns we say that "the chief breeder of war is that group of aggressive ideals, traditions, and ambitions which for the want of a better word we call militarism." Since this is so, we do well to examine with no little care the familiar "drives" from the various military centers of the world.

In our own country, for example, Congress has been in session most of the time since the war closed. It has accumulated much evidence bearing on reorganization of the army and the future military policy of the United States. Many bills have been introduced by sponsors with many theories. But constructive legislation does not evolve, and the longer the delay the greater the differences as to the necessity for universal military training. Two or three causes account for this division of opinion. The more the recent war is studied in its catastrophic results to society at large, the fewer the lawmakers who care to approve making preparations for another one. Moreover, polling of the returned soldiers' opinions is not inducing haste in imposing forced drill in time of peace. In addition, the National Guard forces have had such an experience with "regular"-army discipline and favoritism that they are lining up against anything that the War Department and the General Staff favor. Nor is this all. Evidence accumulates showing that our nation's status in the world of tomorrow is to be based more upon her economic, financial, and political policies toward other nations than on any use of physical power. The world needs no more proof as to what this last may be, if needed; and on short notice, too.

The proprietor and editor of the *Japan Advertiser*, of Tokyo, has recently confessed that it is the domination of the Japanese Government by the military party which has made Japan's motives feared and suspected by the people of China and by many Americans and Europeans. Pointing out that the opposition to this dominance is increasing in Japan, that the liberal element there is being aided by the industrial and commercial elements, he proceeds to point out what we must accept as a matter of fact; namely, that when the ports of Japan were first forced open by the foreigners the Japanese were brought face to face with their inability to resist further exhibitions of force against them, in consequence of which they have been obliged to adopt Western methods—that is to say, the German model for their army and the British model for their navy. Since the Western nations are imperialistic and aggressive, Japan feels that she must be imperialistic and aggressive. After she had waged two wars successfully, and largely because of that display of physical force, Japan was given a place at the Council of Nations in Paris.

In other words, Japan believes that she has taken a

distinguished place among the nations because she has become strong in a militaristic sense. There is nothing in the present condition of world politics to warrant her in believing that militarism is dead. The nations talk of disarmament, but keep on building battleships and submarines. Putting half the American fleet in the Pacific waters has not convinced Japan that it is time for her to reduce armaments. We gather the impression that even among the liberal element in Japan there is no disposition to reduce armaments. Their chief grievance is simply that the military party dominates the civil.

Militarism in England shows no sign of ill health. We are told that the militarists are already beginning to discuss "the next war," as if they were disappointed in the last five years and anxious to see more devastation and to smell more blood. They are saying that the methods employed by the armed forces during the World War have been experiments only. They urge that the war departments must get busy at once and improve upon their experiments, inventing new and more deadly machines. We read that Major General Sir Louis Jackson, officer in charge of offensive gas production and the "Director of Trench Warfare" in the late war, has recently ridiculed the idea that "we have witnessed the last great war." He expressed nothing but contempt for those who desired a reduction of armaments, defending the use of poison gas in warfare, saying that there is no more reason for forbidding the use of gas than for forbidding the use of rifles. Calling attention to the contribution which chemistry, aviation, and commercial machinery must make to the success of the next war, he expressed the view that Germany made a mistake in using explosive instead of incendiary bombs.

Now is the time to "play the game fair." Let us not forget our passionate appeals for support of the war in behalf of a "just and lasting peace," a "war to end war," and to "end militarism." We were not deceiving ourselves then; let us not deceive ourselves now. Let the small group of professional militarists believe in the "next war," if they prefer so to believe. If enough of us talk about another war—bigger, bloodier, and more destructive than the last—and keep at it, we shall certainly get it. And, furthermore, if we continue our propaganda in behalf of a governed world by simply criticising militarism we shall get nowhere. The movement for the peace of the world is big enough to include the militarists; and when that movement has succeeded, as has the prohibition movement in America, then the militarist will just naturally become absorbed as has the bartender in our midst. If the militarists, in the meantime, have any desire to "play the game fair" let them meet the rest of us half way, own up to the hideousness of militaristic philosophy and assist through the society of nations at the death and burial of the foul thing.

AS TO HATING THE GERMANS

THE war having been brought officially to an end Saturday, January 10, and the world now being safe for democracy, we may be pardoned for raising the question, How long does our Christian duty require that we shall continue to hate every German? Since it was a Frenchman, Rochefoucauld, who said, "When our hatred is violent, it sinks us even below those we hate," we shall not be misunderstood if we quote it and repeat our question. Dr. Johnson's fondness for "a good hater" probably had a saturation point. No doubt had he been living during these piping times his appetite would have had more than enough to feed on. Leading writers in England tell us that the English soldier had no hatred for the German soldier as such. Mr. Galsworthy finds the prime sources of hatred for Germans to be in the old men's clubs of London. One hears little of hatred among our doughboys for the individual German. Back in July, 1916, Maurice Maeterlinck wrote: "Question the men returning from the trenches: they detest the enemy; they abhor the aggressor, the unjust and arrogant aggressor, uncouth, too often cruel and treacherous; but they do not hate the man: they do him justice; they pity him; and, after the battle, in the defenseless wounded soldier or disarmed prisoner they recognize, with astonishment, a brother in misfortune who, like themselves, is submitting to duties and laws which, like themselves, he, too, believes lofty and necessary." So our inquiry is, When can we begin to talk less of hatred and somewhat of friendship? When can we begin to get the smell of blood out of our nostrils?

There are scattering evidences that the Christian note is beginning to be sounded here and there. One of our correspondents writes: "I have felt for a long time that we must try to make friends with German youth or there would be danger that they would grow up without faith in God or man, and would thus become a menace to the world." A Quaker American woman now in Berlin writes that the boys and girls there are "starving for friendship as well as for food." Miss Mary N. Chase, Secretary of our New Hampshire Society, having arranged that Christmas cards be sent to a number of German boys and girls, is beginning to receive replies. She says that she has received already over thirty letters from Germany, "all interesting and revealing a fine spirit." The first letter which she received was written in English by a girl eighteen years of age. The letter follows:

BAD BRÜCKMAN (RHÖN),
SINNTHALHOF, November 3, 1919.

DEAR MADAM:

Our school thanks you for your letter. We all are willingly ready to form a comrade-like intercourse with